



ESTABLISHED 1877—NEW SERIES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 1891.

VOL. XI—NO. 3—WHOLE NO. 523.

THE BAPTIST FAITH.

Its Origin, Fundamental Principle, Practice, and Progress.

NO INFANT BAPTISM.

Repentance and Faith Must Precede Outward Ministration.

PRACTICE OF IMMERSION.

No Ancient Church Usage to Show that Sprinkling Meant Baptism.

BY REV. ROBERT STUART MACARTHUR, D. D., PASTOR CALVARY CHURCH, N. Y.

[COPYRIGHT, 1891.]

THE Baptist denomination, in its present form, arose about 250 years ago; that is, in the early Stuart period in England and the early Colonial period in this country. This, however, can hardly be deemed its origin, for it stands closely related to preceding bodies of substantially the same character. To understand the historic relations of the Baptists to other Christians, we must glance backward over the earlier centuries of the Church.

The fundamental principle of the Baptists is that salvation comes only through personal faith in the Lord Jesus; that baptism and other ecclesiastical ceremonies are nothing but symbols; that they do not work salvation, nor are they essential to salvation. This doctrine, now held by many other Christians, was in earlier centuries preached by the Baptists alone, and it is the controversy over this principle which gave rise to Baptist Churches.

The admonition of the Apostles was, "Repent and be baptized." This was addressed to Jews who had been circumcised, and it reveals the difference in the grounds of baptism and circumcision. The Jew was circumcised because he was descended from Abraham; he could be baptized only when he repented of his sins and believed in Jesus Christ. He was circumcised on Abraham's faith; he could be baptized only on his own personal faith. Therefore, while circumcision in the Jewish Church was given to all, baptism in the Apostolic Church was given only to believers, only to those who had personally consecrated themselves to Christ.

REPRESENTATIVE FAITH. The baptism had to precede baptism. The baptism was not supposed to work any spiritual change in the subject; it was given him only as a token that he had already experienced that change. As the baptism is put on a man not to make him a soldier, but because he has already become a soldier, so baptism was given not to make the man a Christian, but because it was believed that he was a Christian already.

It is a common error, however, to confound symbol with substance, the badge of a character with the character itself. And thus men came to speak of baptism as being itself a regeneration, and ere long the idea arose that baptism itself would make a man a Christian, and, furthermore, that no one could be saved without baptism. This led to the custom of giving baptism to infant children, especially to those who were sickly, and who might die before becoming old enough to exercise faith for themselves. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration, the idea that baptism alone would work salvation, and was also essential to salvation, it was this error and this alone which led to the practice of the baptism of unconscious infants.

It was not merely baptism which was given to children too young to believe. As early as the middle of the Third Century, we read in the works of Cyprian of the bringing of little babes to the Lord's Supper and the placing of the sacramental bread in their toothless mouths. This is still the usage of the Greek Church, and for centuries was the

PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME. It is, moreover, a strictly logical usage; for if children may be given baptism without intelligent faith, why may they not be brought to the Lord's Supper also?

But it required some centuries for the usage of infant baptism to gain full currency. In the biographies of many of the great leaders of the early Church we find that, though their parents were Christians, they were not baptized in infancy. Among these are Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory, Nazianzen, Ambrose, Augustine, and Ephrem of Edessa.

As Dean Stanley remarks, in the early ages adult baptism was the rule and infant baptism the exception. This of itself would show that infant baptism was not of Apostolic appointment, but of later origin. The practice gained, however, continually wider acceptance till in the Middle Ages it had become the dominant usage.

But the doctrine of salvation by baptism, and the resultant custom of the baptism of infants, were condemned by different bodies of Christians in various ages of the Church. Among these were the Pelagians of Eastern Europe, with the Petrosians and Henricians in the West. A long catalog could be given of bodies of Christians of various names, who in different parts of Europe, in different centuries, preached the Baptist doctrine of salvation by faith alone. Some of these are said to have held certain errors; in some cases the charge may be true. The errorist is at least an independent thinker, and the daring with which he disents from widely-accepted truths may show itself also in the rejection of a

DOMINANT SUPERSTITION. But it should be noted that we know little

of these Churches, except from the writings of their adversaries, and many of the charges against them may have no basis except in the blind misrepresentations of bigoted opponents.

If the records of Church history were complete, it is not unlikely that it would appear that from the days of the Apostles to the present time there has been a constant succession of churches, closely akin to the Baptists of the present day, congregations of godly men, strictly orthodox in belief, protesting against the doctrine of baptismal regeneration with its resultant error, the baptism of infants.

On the outbreak of the Reformation this Baptist protest was sounded forth throughout the length and breadth of Europe. When Luther and others began to teach that men were justified by faith alone, they were everywhere confronted by the question, Why, then, should infants be baptized?

Congregations of the opponents of infant baptism arose by scores and by hundreds. Their rapid multiplication has seemed to many historians an evidence that they were not entirely a new growth, but largely a part of an earlier ecclesiastical movement, hitherto concealed, but now under more favorable circumstances coming to the light. They were especially numerous in Switzerland, Bavaria, the Tyrol, Moravia, the Rhine country, and the Netherlands.

Among their leaders were men not only of deep piety but also of

GREAT LEARNING.

They were nicknamed Anabaptist, or Re-baptizers, because they baptized on profession of faith those who had received so-called baptism in infancy. But they denied the charge of baptizing again, for they declared that infant baptism was no baptism at all. And the charge is false that they were responsible for the Münster insurrection and other great political disorders. They were men of civil virtue as well as spiritual purity. By scores and by hundreds they were put to death for their evangelical beliefs; no other Christian body of to-day has given so many martyrs to the faith of a pure Gospel as have they. Their congregations are still found in Holland and Germany, where from Mennon, one of their early leaders, they are often called Mennonites. Some of their congregations are found in Pennsylvania and other parts of this country. They differ from the Baptists in certain points, but historically are closely related to them.

We now come to the rise of the modern Baptist denomination. It will be remembered that the Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth went first from England to Holland. While there they came in contact with the Mennonites, who urged that as none but intelligent believers were admitted to the Lord's Supper, so none but believers should be baptized. Thomas Helwys and certain others of the English company felt compelled to adopt this view, and so were excluded from the ranks of their brethren. Helwys and his associates returned to England in 1611, and became what is generally deemed the first congregation of the modern Baptist denomination in Great Britain. Though Baptist doctrines were preached in England in earlier times, and there had been martyrs for them, it is not certain that regular congregations had been formed and maintained.

A quarter of a century after Helwys's return,

JOHN SPILSBURY and certain others of an Independent or Congregational Church in London, discarded infant baptism, and they also formed a Baptist congregation. From these two, and perhaps other sources, Baptist churches were formed in many parts of Great Britain.

Among the early settlers in the American Colonies were Baptists from England and Wales. And all are familiar with the story of how Roger Williams, a Congregational minister in Salem, Mass., adopted Baptist doctrines, was banished from his home, and founded a colony on Baptist principles.

The first Baptist church in Providence claims to have been organized in 1639, but some think that the first Baptist church at Newport was formed a year earlier. The dates of these beginnings are uncertain. It is sufficient, however, to say that Baptist churches were planted here in the early Colonial days, and now they are found throughout the whole land.

Let us now note how widely the principles of the Baptists have been adopted outside their own ranks. The giving of baptism to believers only involves a "converted Church membership," but infant baptism brings into the Church those who are still unconverted, unless, that is, a spiritual change is always wrought in baptism. In the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Episcopal Churches it is not necessary to give

EVIDENCE OF CONVERSION in order to admission to the Lord's Supper and full Church membership; a certificate of baptism is all that is essential. Less than a century ago persons baptized in infancy became full members in Presbyterian, Reformed, and Congregational Churches also without any demand for evidence of a change of heart. In Hodge's Theology, the great Princeton text-book, this is laid down as the correct procedure.

But this left an difference between the Church member and the respectable outsider, except that the former had gone through the ceremony of baptism. All essential difference between the Church and the world was obscured, and even blotted out. A gentleman brought up in one of the State Churches of Europe, on being asked whether he was a Christian, responded, indignantly, "Do I look like a Jew or a Turk?" He had been baptized and confirmed, and this completed his idea of being a Christian.

But in the "great awakening" under the preaching of Edwards and Whitefield a hundred and fifty years ago, when it was proclaimed that a man, even though a baptized Church member, must be converted, immediately the question arose why persons should be baptized and brought into the

HIS OCCUPATION GONE.



The Apparition Which Ruins the Calamity Howler's Business.

Church before they were converted. The more earnest Christians, by thousands and thousands, adopted the Baptist idea of a converted Church membership, rejecting the baptism of infants. Whole congregations, with their ministers, became Baptists. There was a

MARVELOUS INCREASE in Baptist ranks as the result of that great movement, and preachers of to-day like Mr. Moody, who strongly set forth the doctrine that salvation comes not through baptism and Church membership, but only through personal repentance and faith, are doing a vast deal to diffuse Baptist principles. Their converts practically become Baptists, even though they join other than Baptist Churches.

The idea that only converted persons should belong to the Church was originally a distinctive Baptist tenet, but now it has been adopted by nearly all evangelical Christians. Five Presbyterians out of six, if asked regarding one who had been sprinkled in infancy but had not yet made a profession of faith, whether he belonged to the Church would answer No.

There is another doctrine which, though set forth at first by Baptists alone, is now held by nearly or quite all evangelical Christians—the doctrine that all who die in infancy are saved.

The baptism of infants was an outgrowth of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; the idea that in baptism one is made a child of God, and that one cannot be saved without baptism. Infant baptism was based on the idea that all infants dying unbaptized would be lost. This dark and dreary superstition casts a gloom over the history of the Church for centuries. There was mortal terror at the thought that an infant should

DIE UNBAPTIZED. Sometimes in difficulty of birth the infant was sprinkled before birth, and sometimes, it will not be denied, the Cesarean operation was performed, that the babe might not die unbaptized. One dislikes to refer to matters of this sort, but history must be truthfully told.

The history of infant baptism is one of the most horrible chapters in the annals of the Church. Abundant proofs could be given to justify that strong statement. Nor is this superstition wholly extinct. The Lutherans, in their Augsburg Confession, "condemn the Anabaptists, who teach that infants may be saved without baptism." Not only Roman Catholics, but also Episcopalians believe in the baptism of infants. The little babe is borne down the aisle in its holiday garb, the whole meaning of the ceremony is that unless certain drops of water were sprinkled on its brow that beautiful little creature would go down to the darkness of eternal despair. This is a superstition akin to that of "extreme unction"—baptism to unconscious babes, the other rite to unconscious men and women. Such superstitions drive thoughtful men into infidelity.

But in Baptist circles it was taught not only that baptism was not necessary to salvation, but that all who die in infancy are saved. This was a distinctive Baptist tenet, now prevails to a greater or less degree in all evangelical circles.

And corresponding to this difference of

day, a private society, a group of persons apart from the main body of citizens, and thus Church and State were divorced and each was remanded to its own sphere.

Again, in the days when there was a full adherence to doctrine of baptismal regeneration and of direct spiritual efficacy of ecclesiastical ceremonies, it was logical for the civil power to attempt to make men Christians. If baptizing a person would change his spiritual nature and his relations to God, all that was necessary to make a nation a Christian nation was to compel its members to be baptized and to observe the other ecclesiastical rites. If salvation came through outward ceremonies, the observance of which could be compelled by force, it was possible for the civil power to compel men to become Christians. It could not only lead them to the water of life, but by thumbscrew and fagot could make them drink.

Thus Charlemagne and other Christian conquerors compelled vanquished barbarians to go down into the water by tens of thousands to be baptized. And such compulsion seemed a solemn duty to those who believe that the failure to be baptized left the

SOUL TO BE LOST. If baptism could make one a Christian, the Colonel in our late war was bound who gave orders for a detail of men to be baptized.

But the Baptist doctrine, that a man could become a Christian only by the voluntary and free action of his own spiritual nature, made religion a matter which could be settled only between the man and his God, thus leaving nothing to be done by the civil magistrate, who could control only the man's outward actions and could not reach his heart.

A moment's thought will show that there is no reason whatever for saying that the only reason why the Baptists did not strive to extend their doctrines by force as did others, was that they had no power so to do. It was a part of their fundamental belief that external force was utterly ineffectual to make men Christians. Others might abstain from persecution because their pity was stronger than their religious zeal; but the Baptists were restrained from it by logical deductions, namely, because they held that becoming a Christian was an act of the spirit which outward force could not compel.

So they always taught that the civil power should take no cognizance of religious beliefs or purely religious practices of men, whether orthodox or heretic, Turk or heathen, but that these should be left solely to the

JUDGMENT OF GOD. Other Christians have been very candid in recognizing that it was the Baptists who first preached the great doctrine of religious freedom. But it has not always been perceived that this doctrine was a logical outgrowth of the fundamental Baptist principle of a converted Church membership, and that Church ceremonies are to be used only when men have already become Christians.

The divorce between Church and State was not merely a lucky thought of astute Baptist philosophers; it was the logical outcome of distinctive Baptist principles. The Baptists preceded others in declaring the true relations of the civil and ecclesiastical bodies, not because they were superior to other Christians in their understanding of civil principles, but because they held an ecclesiastical tenet which was correct where others were in error.

The condemnation of the use of force in religion was originally a Baptist peculiarity. Down to a comparatively late date, if a man said that the civil magistrate should not interfere in strictly religious matters it was known thereby that he was a Baptist. But this doctrine has now extended to all Churches in our own land, and it is rapidly becoming the doctrine of all Christian countries.

Thus far nothing has been said of baptism or immersion. In a given society, the question What shall be the initiation ceremony? is not so important as the question Who shall be initiated? And so the point insisted on by Baptists is not so much that immersion is the only baptism, as that

ONLY BELIEVERS SHOULD BE BAPTIZED. But the erroneous doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which led to the baptism of infants, gave rise to another superstition, namely, the substitution of pouring and sprinkling for baptism.

The controversy on this subject first appears in the letter of Cyprian to Magnus about the year 250. Certain persons having been converted in sickness when they could not be immersed, water was poured upon them as they lay upon their beds. But there was a refusal to recognize this as valid baptism, and the question was referred to Cyprian, who was one of the leaders in the Church. After discussing the matter, he gives it as his view that in a case of strict necessity, pouring or sprinkling is sufficient; but he freely admits that his mind is not clear on the subject. His words are: "So far as my poor ability comprehendeth the matter," and "So far as in me lies, I have shown what I think." That these expressions are not used in mock modesty is shown in the fact that he declares that he does not wish to influence the action of others in such cases, and he also suggests that should these converts recover they may be immersed.

Now this letter shows beyond dispute that the ordinary act of baptism in that early day was immersion. The question whether immersion could be dispensed with in extraordinary cases shows that in ordinary cases it was always used. In the whole discussion, it is assumed that when a

CONVERT CAN BE BAPTIZED, baptism is, of course, to be administered. No one in that day proposed to employ pouring or sprinkling except when baptism or immersion was impossible.

And this letter proves with equal clearness that immersion was the only act of baptism practiced by the Apostles. Had they ever used pouring or sprinkling, even in a single case, Cyprian, who lived so soon after them, would of course have known it, and of course would never have admitted that there was the least question as to the

propriety of such a use. The Apostles never cite the authority of the Apostles in support of their position, that he give his opinion that pouring or sprinkling may be used in extraordinary cases shows not only that in his time these were not used in ordinary cases, but also that the Apostles had never used them in any case.

That the baptism of the Apostolic Church was immersion is the testimony of scholars of all denominations. Martin Luther declares immersion to have been the primitive act of baptism. John Calvin says: "It is certain that immersion was observed by the ancient Church." John Wesley says that it was "the custom of the first Church."

To the same effect are the utterances of later scholars of all Christian bodies, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Episcopalian and Presbyterian. Says the late Dean Stanley: "There can be no question that the ORIGINAL FORM OF BAPTISM was complete immersion." Says the well-known historian, Dr. Philip Schaff: "Immersion and not sprinkling was unquestionably the original, normal form."

Whole columns could be filled with similar quotations from the ablest scholars, and he it noted that not a single writer, of the rank of these named, rejects these statements. To deny that immersion was the primitive act of baptism is really the wildest absurdity.

But how, then, came pouring and sprinkling to be used? It was because there had arisen in the Church this superstitious idea that water baptism was necessary to salvation. When, therefore, a man was converted on a dying bed or in prison, when baptism was out of the question, pouring or sprinkling was resorted to as the nearest possible approach to the normal act of baptism. These were not considered regular baptisms, but were allowable substitutes when the prescribed act was out of the question.

Pouring and sprinkling were at first used only in cases of necessity. But their superior convenience led to their being employed more and more, till in the course of ages they, in Western Europe,

SUPPLANTED BAPTISM almost entirely. In the Greek Church, however, immersion is still the act of baptism. It continued the ordinary baptism of the Church of Rome for 1,200 years. It was the practice in England down to the reign of Elizabeth.

The Anglican prayer-book still directs that the priest, naming the child, "shall dip it in the water discreetly and warily"; adding, however, that if the parents "shall certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it." The rubric of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America says that the minister "shall dip it in the water discreetly, or shall pour water upon it," not positively prescribing immersion, but giving it the preference of a prior mention. These rules in Churches which have abandoned the use of immersion are historical reminiscences of the primitive practices.

Those churches in Switzerland, Germany and Holland which have been mentioned as coming out in condemnation of the baptism of infants generally continued the usage of pouring and sprinkling. But when Baptist Churches were organized in England and America, they took the position that not only were believers the only proper subjects of baptism, but that a burial in water was its only true act.

THEREFORE, THE REASON why Baptists practice nothing but immersion is this: they do not believe that water baptism is essential to salvation. Accepting the testimony of all scholarship that immersion was the baptism of the Apostolic Church, and prescribed by Christ, they administer this when it is possible; but when, as in case of sickness, this is out of the question, they let the convert die without any water baptism whatever. So far from "making too much of baptism," as is often charged upon them, no Christians, except the Quakers, who reject all water baptism, make so little of it as they. So far from making baptism necessary to salvation, they make salvation necessary to baptism.

None let so many converts die unbaptized as do the Baptists. The assertion that Baptists believe that baptism is necessary to salvation is the silliest, stupidest, most idiotic declaration possible. The case is just the opposite. The very reason why they never resort to sprinkling, which can always be administered, but practice only baptism, which is occasionally out of the question, is that they hold that baptism is not essential to salvation, and that a true convert's soul will not be imperiled if he be allowed to die without having received any water baptism at all.

Pouring and sprinkling would never have been thought of but for the idea that a man's soul was imperiled if he were suffered to die without something in the shape of baptism. Baptists condemn the use of pouring and sprinkling as having been based on the superstitious idea that something which at least resembled baptism was

NECESSARY TO SALVATION. If they believed that water baptism would make one a Christian, they would baptize infants as well as believers. If they believed that a dying man's soul would be lost unless he received something in the nature of baptism, they could use pouring and sprinkling as well as immersion. But, holding clearly and firmly that salvation depends only on intelligent faith and not on some baptismal ceremony, they claim that intelligent believers are the only proper subjects of baptism and that the burial in water, the original ceremony, is its only proper act.

And Baptists refuse to practice pouring and sprinkling for baptism, because they also hold that these are not a fulfillment of Christ's command.

John Calvin says that "the very word baptize signifies to immerse." Martin Luther declares the same. The latest standard lexicons, those of Sophocles, Wilke, Cremer, and Liddell and Scott (later editions), define baptism as meaning immersion, and

(Continued on Eighth page.)

LOYAL MOUNTAINEERS.

Direful Campaign which Terminated at Second Bull Run.

A STUPENDOUS FAILURE.

Troops without Rations and Horses without Forage.

AN INTELLIGENT ARMY.

Great Dissatisfaction Among the Union Troops.

BY LIEUT.-COL. THEODORE F. LANG, 3d W. VA., BALTIMORE, MD.

IV.

PERHAPS no period or campaign during the rebellion furnished so much of disaster and direful results to the Union cause as did that period just following the battle of McDowell, beginning about May 15 and terminating Aug. 30 with the second battle of Bull Run, embracing the operations of Gen. Fremont, Banks, Shields, Sigel, McDowell and Pope. I shall, however, speak of this campaign under the head of two grand divisions, both as to date and designated commanders. In the earlier operations of the campaign the army was known under three divisions, viz: The Mountain Department, Gen. Fremont commanding; the Department of the Shenandoah, Gen. Banks commanding; and the Department of the Rappahannock, Gen. McDowell commanding. The second or later

part of the campaign contemplates the consolidation of the above-named armies, and with other troops designated as the Army of Virginia, commanded by Gen. John Pope, terminating with the disastrous battle of second Bull Run. It is not my purpose to enter into a full detail of this long campaign, giving exact date and detail of each march, skirmish and battle, but rather to speak of them in a general way, perhaps occasionally turning aside from the main question to speak of a man as I found him, or to relate some incidents in the history of his early or army life.



GEN. N. P. BANKS.

As I purpose criticizing the general management of the campaign, and shall charge that it was the most stupendous failure of all the campaigns of the war, not excepting the early operations of the Army of the Potomac before Richmond, I shall ask the reader to take a map showing Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Ohio, and trace the leading railroads that connect

THE GREAT SOUTHWEST via middle and southern Virginia to Richmond and the Tidewater, then trace from those thoroughfares the main railroads and water courses to the northward, with Washington City and Baltimore as objective points—the goal to which the Confederacy bent its constant energies and highest aims (it must not be forgotten that great railroad lines and water courses are essential elements in handling armies)—and you will see six great natural leading arteries of travel which the Confederate armies must take in order to accomplish this end: First, via the Kanawha Valley, in West Virginia, which was impracticable; second, through Tygart's Valley,



JESSIE SCOTTS.

also in West Virginia, impracticable; third, the Shenandoah Valley; fourth, the Orange & Alexandria Railroad route; fifth, the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad, and, sixth, the Chesapeake Bay and Potomac River route, the three latter named being strongly guarded by the Army of the Potomac; therefore, the Shenandoah Valley was the only practicable route open.

To this great center the Confederates could readily concentrate troops and supplies from either the east or southwest. This fact was